arXiv:1205.5450v2 [math.AP] 28 Feb 2013

WELL-POSEDNESS RESULTS FOR THE DISPERSION GENERALIZED BENJAMIN-ONO EQUATION VIA THE CONTRACTION PRINCIPLE

GERMÁN FONSECA, FELIPE LINARES, AND GUSTAVO PONCE

Abstract. We study the initial value problem associated to the dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equation. Our aim is to establish well-posedness results in weighted Sobolev spaces via contraction principle under minimal requirements in the weighted order of the space. One of our new main ideas is the deduction of a pointwise estimate concerning the group describing the solution of the linear problem and the fractional weights.

1. Introduction

In this work we shall study the initial value problem (IVP) for the dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono (DGBO) equation

$$\begin{cases}\partial_t u - D^{1+a}\partial_x u + u\partial_x u = 0, & t, x \in \mathbb{R}, \quad 0 \le a \le 1,\\ u(x,0) = u_0(x),\end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where D^s denotes the homogeneous derivative of order $s \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$D^s = (-\partial_x^2)^{s/2} \quad \text{so} \quad D^s f = c_s\big(|\xi|^s \widehat{f}\,\big)^{\vee}, \quad \text{with} \quad D^s = (\mathcal{H}\,\partial_x)^s,$$

and $\mathcal{H}$ denotes the Hilbert transform,

$$\mathcal{H}f(x) = \frac{1}{\pi}\lim_{\epsilon\downarrow 0}\int\limits_{|y|\ge\epsilon}\frac{f(x-y)}{y}\,dy = (-i\,\mathrm{sgn}(\xi)\widehat{f}(\xi))^{\vee}(x).$$

When $a = 1$ the equation in (1.1) becomes the Korteweg-de Vries (KdV) equation

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u + u\partial_x u = 0, \qquad t, x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.2}$$

and for $a = 0$ the equation in (1.1) is the Benjamin-Ono (BO) equation

$$\partial_t u - \mathcal{H}\partial_x^2 u + u\partial_x u = 0, \qquad t, x \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.3}$$

Both the KdV and the BO equations originally arise as models in one-dimensional waves propagation (see [37], [4], and [46]) and have widely been studied in many different contexts. In particular, these two equations satisfy infinitely many conservation laws and are integrable by the inverse scattering method (see [2] and [11]).

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 35B05. Secondary: 35B60.

Key words and phrases. Benjamin-Ono equation, weighted Sobolev spaces.

The second author was supported by CNPq and FAPERJ/Brasil.

The third author is supported by the NSF DMS-1101499.

For $0 < a < 1$ the equations in (1.1) are not integrable, but their real solutions still satisfy three conservation laws

$$I_1 = \int u(x,t)dx, \tag{1.4}$$

$$I_2 = \int |u(x,t)|^2\, dx, \tag{1.5}$$

and

$$I_3 = \int |D_x^{(1+a)/2} u(x,t)|^2 dx - \frac{1}{6}\int u^3(x,t)dx. \tag{1.6}$$

We shall be mainly concerned with the well-posedness of the IVP (1.1). As in [26] we shall say that the IVP (1.1) is said to be locally well posed (LWP) in the function space X if for each $u_0 \in X$ there exist $T = T(\|u_0\|_X) > 0$ and a unique solution $u \in C([-T,T] : X) \cap .... = Y_T$ of the equation in (1.1), with the map data → solution being locally continuous from X to Y_T. If T can be taken arbitrarily large, then the IVP (1.1) is said to be globally well posed (GWP).

In the case of the KdV equation, $a = 1$ in (1.1), the well-posedness problem in classical Sobolev spaces

$$H^s(\mathbb{R}) = (1-\partial_x^2)^{-s/2} L^2(\mathbb{R}) = J^{-s} L^2(\mathbb{R}), \qquad s \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.7}$$

has been studied in [48], [7], [26], [30], [8], [32], [14], and finally in [19] and [34] where global well-posedness was established for $s \geq -3/4$.

In the case of the BO equation, $a = 0$ in (1.1), the well-posedness problem in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ has been considered in [1], [25], [47], [35], [27], [50], [10], [41] and in [23] where global well-posedness was established for $s \geq 0$.

In the case $a \in (0,1)$ Kenig, Ponce and Vega [32] showed that the IVP (1.1) is LWP in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ if $s \geq 3/2 - 3a/4$. This LWP and the conservation laws (1.5)-(1.6) lead to GWP for $a \geq 4/5$.

In [35] Koch and Tzvetkov improved the result in [32] by proving LWP in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s \geq (9-3a)/8$. This LWP combined with the conservation laws (1.5)-(1.6) yield GWP for $a > 5/7$.

In [44] Molinet, Saut and Tzvetkov showed that for any $s \in \mathbb{R}$ and any $T > 0$ the map data solution $u_0 \to u(x,t)$ for the IVP (1.1) with $a \in [0,1)$ from $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ to $C([0,T] : H^s(\mathbb{R}))$ is not C^2 (see also [36]). In particular, this implies that no well-posedness result for (1.1) can be established based solely in a contraction principle argument. Also this result shows that the splitting frequency argument given in [9] and the "I-method" introduced in [13] used to obtain GWP below the conservation laws do not apply for the equation in (1.1) with $a \in [0,1)$.

The result in [44] motivated the study of the well-posedness of the IVP (1.1) in other spaces rather than the classical Sobolev spaces (1.7).

In [12] Colliander, Kenig and Staffilani obtained LWP via contraction principle for the IVP (1.1) in F^s with $s \geq (1+a)/2$ where

$$F^s = \{f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}) \,:\, J^{s-(1+a)}(xf) \in L^2(\mathbb{R})\}$$

with the norm

$$\|f\|_{F^s} = \|f\|_{s,2} + \|xf\|_{s-(1+a),2}.$$

The proof in [12] relies on a contraction principle argument applied on a modified version of the so called Bourgain's space introduced in the context of dispersive equations in [8]. We observe that when $s = 1+a$ one has

$$Z_{1+a,1} \equiv H^{1+a}(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(|x|^2 dx). \tag{1.8}$$

In [43] Molinet and Ribaud obtained a well-posedness result via contraction principle for the IVP (1.1) with $a \in (0,1)$ in the weighted low frequency Sobolev spaces

$$H^s_{-\gamma}(\mathbb{R}) = \{f : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R} : \|\langle \xi \rangle^s \langle |\xi|^{-\gamma} \rangle \widehat{f}\|_2 < \infty\}.$$

More precisely, it was shown in [43] that the IVP (1.1) is LWP in $H^s_{-\gamma}(\mathbb{R})$ with $s > (2+a)/4$ and $\gamma \in [(4+3a)/(8+8a), 1]$, and GWP if in addition $s \geq (1+a)/2$.

In [21] Herr showed LWP for the IVP (1.1) in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s > -3a/4$ (and GWP for $s \geq 0$) with an additional low frequency constraint on the initial data.

Latter, in [20] Guo, inspirited in the work of Ionescu, Kenig and Tataru [24] on the KP-I equation, obtained LWP for the IVP (1.1) in $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ for $s > 1-a$. This and the conservation laws yield GWP for $a > 1/2$.

Finally, in [22] Herr, Ionescu, Kenig and Koch were able to establish the GWL of the IVP (1.1) with $a \in (0,1)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

In order to present our results, we introduce the weighted Sobolev spaces

$$Z_{s,\rho} = H^s(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(|x|^{2\rho} dx), \;\; s, \rho \in \mathbb{R}. \tag{1.9}$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let* $a \in (0,1)$. *If* $u_0 \in Z_{s,\rho}$ *with* $s > 3/2 - 3a/4$ *and*

$$\rho = \rho_a = \frac{3(4-a)(2-a)}{4(8+a-3a^2)}.$$

Then for any $T > 0$ *there exists a unique solution*

$$u \in C([-T,T] : Z_{s,\rho}) \tag{1.10}$$

of the IVP (1.1) *satisfying*

$$\|D_x^{s+(1+a)/2} u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T} < \infty, \tag{1.11}$$

$$\|u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T} + \|u\|_{L^{1+a}_x L^\infty_T} < \infty, \tag{1.12}$$

and

$$\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x} < \infty. \tag{1.13}$$

Moreover, for any $T' \in (0,T)$ *there exists a neighborhood* W *of* u_0 *in* $Z_{s,\rho} = H^s(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(|x|^{2\rho} dx)$ *such that the map* $\widetilde{u}_0 \mapsto \widetilde{u}(t)$ *from* W *into the class defined by* (1.10)–(1.13) *is smooth.*

Remarks: (a) It will be clear from the proof of Theorem 1.1 given below that if in addition we assume that

$$u_0 \in H^{s'}(\mathbb{R}), \quad |x|^{\rho'} u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$$

with

$$\rho' \in (\rho_a, \frac{5}{2} + a) \quad \text{and} \quad s' > \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{4}a + (1+a)(\rho' - \rho_a)$$

then

$$u \in C([0,T] : H^{s'}(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(|x|^{2\rho'} dx)).$$

(b) We recall that persistence properties in $Z_{s,k}$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}^+$ and $s \geq k(1+a)$ can be deduced from the commutative property of the operators

$$\Gamma_a = x + (2+a)tD^{1+a}, \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_a = \partial_t - D^{1+a}\partial_x, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad [\Gamma_a; \mathcal{L}_a] = 0, \tag{1.14}$$

which implies that

$$x\, W_a(t)u_0(x) = W_a(t)(xu_0)(x) - (2+a)tW_a(t)(D^{1+a}u_0)(x), \tag{1.15}$$

with $\{W_a(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ denoting the unitary group in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ defined by

$$W_a(t)u_0(x) = (e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\widehat{u_0}(\xi))^{\vee}(x). \tag{1.16}$$

One of our main ideas in the proof of Theorem 1.1 is to deduce a pointwise formula for the "fractional weights". More precisely we shall prove :

Lemma 1.2. *Let $n = 1$, $\alpha \in (0,1)$ and $a \geq 0$. Let $\{W_a(t) : t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ be the unitary group of operators defined in* (1.16). *If*

$$u_0 \in Z_{\alpha(1+a),\alpha} = H^{\alpha(1+a)}(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(|x|^{2\alpha}dx), \tag{1.17}$$

then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$|x|^{\alpha}W_a(t)u_0(x) = W_a(t)(|x|^{\alpha}u_0)(x) + W_a(t)\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^{\vee}(x) \tag{1.18}$$

with

$$\|\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^{\vee}\|_2 \leq c(1+|t|)(\|u_0\|_2 + \|D^{\alpha(1+a)}u_0\|_2). \tag{1.19}$$

Moreover, if in addition to (1.17) *one has that for $\beta \in (0,\alpha)$*

$$D^{\beta}(|x|^{\alpha}u_0) \in L^2(\mathbb{R}) \quad \text{and} \quad u_0 \in H^{\beta+\alpha(1+a)}(\mathbb{R}), \tag{1.20}$$

then for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and for almost every $x \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\begin{aligned} &D^{\beta}(|x|^{\alpha}W_a(t)u_0)(x) \\ &\quad = W_a(t)(D^{\beta}|x|^{\alpha}u_0)(x) + W_a(t)(D^{\beta}(\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^{\vee}))(x) \end{aligned} \tag{1.21}$$

with

$$\|D^{\beta}(\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^{\vee})\|_2 \leq c(1+|t|)(\|u_0\|_2 + \|D^{\beta+\alpha(1+a)}u_0\|_2). \tag{1.22}$$

(1.18)-(1.19) can be seen as an extension of (1.15) for fractional weights. As it will be remarked below the result in Lemma 1.2 can be adapted to general groups describing the solution of the linear part of a dispersive equation.

The proof of Lemma 1.2 will be based on a characterization of the generalized Sobolev space

$$L^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) = (1-\Delta)^{-\alpha/2}L^p(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \alpha \in (0,2), \ p \in (1,\infty), \tag{1.23}$$

due to E. M. Stein [49] (see Theorem D below).

We observe that the result in Theorem 1.1 is global in time. This will follow by combining the fact that the solutions constructed here agree with those in [30] and those in [22] (which are global in time) and that in the estimates the weighted norms appear linearly together with others which are *a priori* bounded in any given interval. Since our argument is based on the contraction principle one has that the map data → solution is locally (in time) smooth, from $Z_{s,\rho}$ into the class defined by (1.10)–(1.13).

The value $s > 3/2 - 3a/4$ already appears in the LWP result in [30] and as there the proof is based in the use of several mixed space time norms (describing the smoothing effect, the Strichartz estimates and the maximal function). However, here the proof on the weighted spaces is based in a contraction principle. Also we notice that the weight ρ_a satisfies

$$\rho = \rho_a = \frac{3(4-a)(2-a)}{4(8+a-3a^2)} \in (0,1).$$

In this regard, we have that in a previous work [17] we found the maximum decay of a solution of (1.1).

More precisely, in [15]–[16] for $a = 0$ and in [17] for $0 < a < 1$ we prove the following results:

Theorem A. *Let* $a \in [0,1)$.

(a) *If* $u_0 \in Z_{s,\rho}$ *with* $s \geq s_0(\rho,a) \geq \rho(1+a)$ *and* $\rho \in [0, 5/2+a)$*, then the solution* u *the IVP* (1.1) *found in* [22] *satisfies that*

$$u \in C([-T,T] : Z_{s,\rho}).$$

(b) *If* $u_0 \in \dot{Z}_{s,\rho} = \{f \in Z_{s,\rho} : \widehat{f}(0) = 0\}$ *with* $s \geq s_0(\rho,a) \geq \rho(1+a)$ *and* $\rho \in [5/2+a, 7/2+a)$*, then the solution* u *of the IVP* (1.1) *found in* [22] *satisfies*

$$u \in C([-T,T] : \dot{Z}_{s,\rho}).$$

(c) *Let* $u \in C([-T,T] : Z_{s,(5/2+a)^-})$ *with* $s \geq s_0(a) > 0$ *and* $T > 0$ *and be a solution the IVP* (1.1)*. If there exist two times* $t_1, t_2 \in [-T,T]$, $t_1 \neq t_2$*, such that*

$$u(\cdot,t_j) \in Z_{s,5/2+a}, \quad j = 1,2. \tag{1.24}$$

Then $\widehat{u}(0,t) = \widehat{u}_0(0) = 0$, $\forall t \in [-T,T]$.

Remarks: (a) Theorem A part (c) shows that persistence in $Z_{s,\rho}$ with $\rho = (5/2+a)^-$ is the best possible for general initial data. So we have that there are solutions $u = u(x,t)$ of the IVP (1.1) with

$$|x|^{(5/2+a)^-} u \in L^\infty([0,T] : L^2(\mathbb{R})), \qquad T > 0,$$

but there does not exist a non-trivial solution u corresponding to data u_0 with $\widehat{u}_0(0) \neq 0$ such that

$$|x|^{5/2+a} u \in L^\infty([0,T'] : L^2(\mathbb{R})), \qquad \text{for some} \quad T' > 0.$$

(b) The result in Theorem A for $s = 1+a$ was established in [12].

Theorem B. *Let* $u \in C([-T,T] : \dot{Z}_{s,(7/2+a)^-})$ *with* $s \geq s_0(a)$ *and* $T > 0$ *be a non-trivial solution of the IVP* (1.1)*. If there exist three different times* $t_1, t_2, t_3 \in [-T,T]$ *such that*

$$u(\cdot,t_j) \in \dot{Z}_{s,7/2+a}, \quad j = 1,2,3. \tag{1.25}$$

Then $u \equiv 0$.

Remarks: (a) Theorem B shows that the decay $\rho = (7/2+a)^-$ is the largest possible. More precisely, Theorem A part (b) tells us that there are non trivial solutions $u = u(x,t)$ verifying

$$|x|^{(7/2+a)^-} u \in L^\infty([0,T] : L^2(\mathbb{R})), \qquad T > 0,$$

and Theorem B guarantees that there does not exist a non-trivial solution such that

$$|x|^{7/2+a} u \in L^\infty([0,T'] : L^2(\mathbb{R})), \qquad \text{for some} \quad T' > 0.$$

(b) Theorem A part (a) with $\rho = 1, 2$ and part (b) with $\rho = 3$ and Theorem B with $\rho = 4$ for the BO equation ($a = 0$) were obtained in [25].

Theorem C. *Let* $u \in C([-T, T] : Z_{s,(7/2+a)^-})$ *with* $T > 0$ *and* $s \geq s_0(a)$ *be a non-trivial solution of the IVP* (1.1) *such that*

$$u_0 \in \dot{Z}_{s,\frac{7}{2}+\tilde{a}},\ \tilde{a} = [1 + 2a]/2, \qquad \textit{and} \qquad \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x\, u_0(x)\, dx \neq 0. \tag{1.26}$$

Then there exists a unique $t^* \neq 0$ *such that* $u(t^*) \in \dot{Z}_{s,\frac{7}{2}+\tilde{a}}$.

Remarks: (a) Notice that $\tilde{a} > a$, so Theorem C shows that the condition of Theorem B at two times is in general not sufficient to guarantee that $u \equiv 0$. So, in this regard Theorem B is optimal.

The linear growth in "a" of the strongest possible spatial decay of the solution of (1.1) is consistent with the form of the traveling wave solutions of the DGBO equation. Let

$$v(x, t) = c^{1+a}\, \phi_a(c(x - c^{1+a}\, t)), \qquad c > 0,$$

where ϕ_a is called the ground state, which is an even, positive, decreasing (for $x > 0$) function. In the case of the KdV equation ($a = 1$ in (1.1)) one has that

$$\phi_1(x) = \frac{3}{2}\operatorname{sech}^2\left(\frac{x}{2}\right),$$

whose uniqueness follows from the elliptic theory. In the case of the BO equation ($a = 0$ in (1.1)) one has that

$$\phi_0(x) = \frac{4}{1 + x^2}, \tag{1.27}$$

whose uniqueness (up to symmetry of the equation) was established in [3].

In the case $a \in (0, 1)$ in (1.1) the existence of the ground state was established in [51] by variational arguments. Recently, uniqueness of the ground state for $a \in (0, 1)$ was established in [18]. However, no explicit formula is known for ϕ_a, $a \in (0, 1)$. In [28] the following upper bound for the decay of the ground state was deduced

$$\phi_a(x) \leq \frac{c_a}{(1 + x^2)^{1+a/2}}, \qquad 0 < a < 1.$$

Thus, one has that for $a \in [0, 1)$ the ground state has a very mild decay which increases linearly with the parameter a as in the results in Theorem 1.1. Roughly speaking, this is a consequence of the non-smoothness of the symbol modeling the dispersive relation in (1.1) $\sigma_a(\xi) = |\xi|^{1+a}\, \xi$.

It will be clear from our arguments below that in the case of higher power in the nonlinearity in (1.1) i.e.

$$\partial_t u - D^{1+a}\partial_x u + u^k \partial_x u = 0, \quad k = 2, 3, \dots \quad a \in (0, 1),$$

the contraction principle applies directly in the spaces $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, with $s > s_0(k)$ without the need of the weight.

Our approach also allows to extend known results for solutions of the KdV equations to solutions of the IVP (1.1). In [5] Bona and Saut proved that there exist initial data $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ satisfying $u_0(0) = \infty$ and their corresponding solutions $u(x, t)$ of the KdV equation are continuous in $\mathbb{R}^2 - \{(0, 0)\}$ and bounded away from the origin. They called this phenomenon "dispersive blow-up". A key observation in this analysis is the smoothing property of the integral term in the Duhamel representation of the solution. This regularity was obtained in [5] establishing a local theory for the IVP associated to the generalized KdV equation

$$\partial_t u + \partial_x^3 u + u^k \partial_x u = 0, \quad k \in \mathbb{Z}^+ \tag{1.28}$$

in weighted spaces. In [39] this property was proved using smoothing estimates for $k \geq 2$. Similar results were obtained for the cubic nonlinear Schrödinger equation ([6]) and higher dispersion equations ([38]).

In the same regard, we have that from Kato's existence theory in [26] for the KdV in the weighted spaces $L^2((1+e^x)dx)$ that the solution $u(x,t)$ corresponding to datum $u_0(x) = e^{-|x|}$ satisfies that $u \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2 - \{(0,0)\})$. In this direction we shall prove:

Theorem 1.3. *There exist initial data* $u_0 \in C^1(\mathbb{R} - \{0\})$ *such that the corresponding solutions* $u(x,t)$ *of the IVP* (1.1) *satisfy that*

$$u(\cdot,t) \in C^1(\mathbb{R}), \qquad \forall\, t \neq 0.$$

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: section 2 contains all the preliminary estimates to be used in the proof of Theorem 1.1 including the proof of Lemma 1.2. Section 3 contains the proof of Theorem 1.1. Finally, Theorem 1.3 will be proven in section 4.

2. Preliminary Estimates

We recall that solutions of the linear IVP

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t u - D_x^{1+a} \partial_x u = 0, & x,t \in \mathbb{R}, \;\; a \in (0,1) \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x) \end{cases} \tag{2.29}$$

are given by the unitary group $\{W_a(t)\}_{-\infty}^{\infty}$, defined via Fourier transform by

$$W_a(t)u_0 = \left(e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\widehat{u}_0\right)^{\vee}. \tag{2.30}$$

Solutions of the linear problem (2.29) satisfy several regularizing properties. We begin listing some of them.

Proposition 2.1. *(Linear Estimates) Let* $a \in (0,1)$*.*

(1) *Homogeneous smoothing effects,*

$$\|D_x^{(1+a)/2} W_a(t) f\|_{L_x^\infty L_T^2} \leq c_a \, \|f\|_2 \tag{2.31}$$

and

$$\|D_x^{(1+a)/2} \int_0^t W_a(t-t')F(t')dt'\|_{L_x^\infty L_T^2} \leq c\, \|F\|_{L_T^1 L_x^2}. \tag{2.32}$$

(2) *Nonhomogeneous smoothing effect,*

$$\|D_x^{1+a} \int_0^t W_a(t-t')F(t')dt'\|_{L_x^\infty L_T^2} \leq c\|F\|_{L_x^1 L_T^2}. \tag{2.33}$$

(3) *Dual estimate, for all* $t \in [0,T]$

$$\|D_x^{(1+a)/2} \int_0^t W_a(t-t')F(t')dt'\|_{L_x^2} \leq c\|F\|_{L_x^1 L_T^2}. \tag{2.34}$$

(4) L^2 *maximal function estimate,*

$$\|W_a(t)f\|_{L^2_xL^\infty_T} \le c\,(1+T)^\rho\,\|f\|_{s,2} \tag{2.35}$$

where $\rho > 3/4$ *and* $s > (2+a)/4$.

(5) L^4 *maximal function estimate,*

$$\|W_a(t)f\|_{L^4_xL^\infty_T} \le c\,\|D_x^{1/4}f\|_2. \tag{2.36}$$

(6) *Strichartz estimates, for any* $(\theta,\gamma) \in [0,1]\times[0,a/2]$

$$\|D_x^{(\theta\gamma)/2}W_a(t)f\|_{L^q_tL^p_x} \le c\,\|f\|_2 \tag{2.37}$$

where $(q,p) = (2(2+a)/\theta(\gamma+1), 2/(1-\theta))$.

Proof. The estimates (2.31), (2.33) and (2.35) were proved in [32]. The inequalities (2.36) and (2.37) were established in [29]. Finally estimate (2.32) follows from (2.31) and group properties. For further details we refer to [40]. ☐

Remark 2.2. *Notice that for* $(\theta,\gamma) = (1, a/2)$*, the estimate* (2.37) *becomes*

$$\|D^{a/4}W_a(t)f\|_{L^4_tL^\infty_x} \le c\,\|f\|_2. \tag{2.38}$$

Lemma 2.3. *For* $a \in (0,1)$ *it holds*

$$\|W_a(t)f\|_{L^{4/(1+\theta)}_xL^\infty_T} \le c_T\,\|f\|_{\left(\frac{1+(1+a)\theta}{4}\right)^+,2}, \quad \theta\in[0,1], \tag{2.39}$$

$$\|\partial_x\int_0^t W_a(t-t')F(t')dt'\|_{L^\infty_xL^2_T} \le cT^{a/(1+a)}\,\|F\|_{L^{1+a}_xL^2_T}, \tag{2.40}$$

and

$$\|D_x^s\int_0^t W_a(-t')F(t')dt'\|_{L^\infty_TL^2_x} \le cT^{a/(1+a)}\,\|D_x^{s-(1-a)/2}F\|_{L^{1+a}_xL^2_T}. \tag{2.41}$$

Proof. The inequality (2.39) follows interpolating the estimates (2.35) and (2.36).

From estimates (2.33) and (2.32) and interpolation we obtain (2.40).

Finally, the inequality (2.41) is established using the estimate (2.34), group properties and interpolation. ☐

One of the key linear estimates is next.

Lemma 2.4. *For* $a \in (0,1)$ *and* $t \in [0,T]$

$$\|W_a(t)f\|_{L^{1+a}_xL^\infty_T} \le c_T\left(\||x|^{\omega+}f\|_{\beta,2} + \|f\|_{\frac{(4-a)}{4},2}\right) \tag{2.42}$$

where $\omega = \dfrac{4-a}{4(2+a)}$ *and* $\beta = \dfrac{4-a}{4(2+a)}$.

Proof. We first see that Hölder's inequality shows that for $\theta \in (0,1)$ and $\omega = \dfrac{4-(1+\theta)(1+a)}{4(1+a)}$

$$\|f\|_{L^{1+a}_x} \le c\,\|\langle x\rangle^{\omega+}f\|_{L^{4/1+\theta}_x}. \tag{2.43}$$

Now using (2.43), the formula (1.18) in Lemma 1.2 and inequality (2.39) we have for $t \in [0,T]$ that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|W_a(t)f\|_{L_x^{1+a}L_T^\infty} \le c_T\|\langle x\rangle^{\omega+}W_a(t)f\|_{L_x^{4/1+\theta}L_T^\infty}\\
&\le c_T(\||x|^{\omega+}W_a(t)f\|_{L_x^{4/1+\theta}L_T^\infty} + \|W_a(t)f\|_{L_x^{4/1+\theta}L_T^\infty})\\
&\le c_T(\|W_a(t)|x|^{\omega+}f\|_{L_x^{4/1+\theta}L_T^\infty} + \|W_a(t)\Phi_{a,t,\omega}(f)\|_{L_x^{4/1+\theta}L_T^\infty}\\
&\quad + \|f\|_{\left(\frac{1+(1+a)\theta}{4}\right)^+,2})\\
&\le c_T(\,\||x|^{\omega+}f\|_{\beta,2} + \|D^\beta\Phi_{a,t,\omega}(f)\|_{L_x^2} + \|f\|_{\left(\frac{1+(1+a)\theta}{4}\right)^+,2})\\
&\le c_T\,(\||x|^{\omega+}f\|_{\beta,2} + \|f\|_{(1+a)\omega+\beta,2})\\
&\le c_T\,(\||x|^{\omega+}f\|_{\beta,2} + \|f\|_{\frac{(4-a)}{4},2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

□

Remark 2.5. *We observe that the next inequality holds*

$$\|J_x^\beta(\langle x\rangle^{\omega+}f)\|_{L^2} \le \|\langle x\rangle^\rho f\|_{L^2}^{1-\nu}\|J_x^{3/2-3a/4}f\|_{L^2}^\nu \tag{2.45}$$

with $\nu = \dfrac{4-a}{3(4-a^2)}$ *and* $\rho = \dfrac{3(4-a)(2-a)}{4(8+a-3a^2)}$, *(see for instance* [45]*).*

We also notice that by using the class of pseudo-differential operators described in [28] *it follows: for* a, $b \in (0,1)$

$$\|\langle x\rangle^a J^b f\|_2 \sim \|J^b(\langle x\rangle^a f)\|_2.$$

Next, we recall the Leibniz rule for fractional derivatives proved in [31].

Lemma 2.6. *Let* $\alpha \in (0,1)$, α_1, $\alpha_2 \in [0,\alpha]$ *with* $\alpha = \alpha_1+\alpha_2$. *Let* $p, p_1, p_2, q, q_1, q_2 \in (1,\infty)$ *be such that* $\frac{1}{p} = \frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2}$ *and* $\frac{1}{q} = \frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2}$. *Then*

$$\|D_x^\alpha(fg) - D_x^\alpha fg - fD_x^\alpha g\|_{L_x^pL_T^q} \le c\|D_x^{\alpha_1}f\|_{L_x^{p_1}L_T^{q_1}}\|D_x^{\alpha_2}f\|_{L_x^{p_2}L_T^{q_2}}. \tag{2.46}$$

Moreover, for $\alpha_1 = 0$ *the value* $q_1 = \infty$ *is allowed.*

Finally, we turn our attention to the proof of Lemma 1.2. We shall start with a characterization of the Sobolev space

$$L^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) = (1-\Delta)^{-\alpha/2}L^p(\mathbb{R}^n), \quad \alpha \in (0,2), \;\; p \in (1,\infty), \tag{2.47}$$

due to E. M. Stein [49]. For $\alpha \in (0,2)$ define

$$D_\alpha f(x) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{c_\alpha}\int_{|y|\ge\epsilon}\frac{f(x+y)-f(x)}{|y|^{n+\alpha}}dy, \tag{2.48}$$

where

$$c_\alpha = \pi^{n/2}\,2^{-\alpha}\,\Gamma(-\alpha/2)/\Gamma((n+2)/2). \tag{2.49}$$

As it was remarked in [49] for appropriate f, for example $f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R}^n)$, one has

$$\widehat{D_\alpha f}(\xi) = \widehat{D^\alpha f}(\xi) \equiv |\xi|^\alpha\,\widehat{f}(\xi). \tag{2.50}$$

The following result concerning the $L^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) = (1-\Delta)^{\alpha/2}L^p(\mathbb{R}^n)$ spaces was established in [49]:

Theorem D. *Let $\alpha \in (0,2)$ and $p \in (1,\infty)$. Then $f \in L^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ if and only if*

$$\begin{cases} (a)\ \ f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n), \\ \\ (b)\ \ D_\alpha f \in L^p(\mathbb{R}^n), \qquad\qquad (D_\alpha f(x)\ \text{ defined in } (2.48)), \end{cases} \tag{2.51}$$

with

$$\|f\|_{\alpha,p} = \|(1-\Delta)^{\alpha/2} f\|_p \simeq \|f\|_p + \|D_\alpha f\|_p \simeq \|f\|_p + \|\,D^\alpha f\|_p. \tag{2.52}$$

Notice that if $f,\ fg \in L^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and $g \in L^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n) \cap C^2(\mathbb{R}^n)$ one has

$$\begin{aligned} D_\alpha(fg)(x) &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{c_\alpha} \int_{|y|\geq\epsilon} \frac{f(x+y)\,g(x+y) - f(x)\,g(x)}{|y|^{n+\alpha}} dy \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{c_\alpha} \int_{|y|\geq\epsilon} g(x) \frac{f(x+y) - f(x)}{|y|^{n+\alpha}} dy \\ &\quad + \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{c_\alpha} \int_{|y|\geq\epsilon} \frac{(g(x+y)-g(x))f(x+y)}{|y|^{n+\alpha}} dy \\ &= g(x)\,D_\alpha f(x) + \Lambda_\alpha((g(\cdot+y)-g(\cdot))f(\cdot+y))(x). \end{aligned} \tag{2.53}$$

In particular, if $g(x) = e^{i\phi(x)}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\Lambda_\alpha((g(\cdot+y)-g(\cdot))f(\cdot+y))(x) \\ &= \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{c_\alpha} \int_{|y|\geq\epsilon} \frac{(g(x+y)-g(x))f(x+y)}{|y|^{n+\alpha}} dy \\ &= e^{i\phi(x)} \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \frac{1}{c_\alpha} \int_{|y|\geq\epsilon} \frac{e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))} - 1}{|y|^{n+\alpha}} f(x+y) dy. \end{aligned} \tag{2.54}$$

Thus, one gets the identity

$$D_\alpha(e^{i\phi(\cdot)} f)(x) = e^{i\phi(x)}\, D_\alpha f(x) + e^{i\phi(x)}\, \Lambda_\alpha((e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))} - 1) f(\cdot+y))(x). \tag{2.55}$$

Assuming that

$$n = 1, \qquad \alpha \in (0,1), \qquad \phi(x) = \phi_{a,t}(x) = t\,|x|^{1+a} x, \qquad \text{with} \quad a \geq 0, \tag{2.56}$$

we shall obtain a bound for

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Lambda_\alpha((e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))} - 1) f(\cdot+y))\|_p \\ &= \|\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} \int_{|y|\geq\epsilon} \frac{e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))} - 1}{|y|^{1+\alpha}} f(x+y) dy\,\|_p. \end{aligned} \tag{2.57}$$

We restrict ourselves to the case $\alpha \in (0,1)$ which allows us to perform estimates by passing the absolute value inside the integral sign in (2.54).

We recall the elementary estimates

$$\begin{cases} (a) \quad \forall\,\theta\in\mathbb{R} \qquad |e^{i\theta}-1|\le 2, \\ (b) \quad \forall\,\theta\in\mathbb{R} \qquad |e^{i\theta}-1|\le 2|\sin(\theta/2)|\le|\theta|. \end{cases} \tag{2.58}$$

Combining (2.58) (a) and Minkowski's integral inequality it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\int_{|y|\ge 1/100}\frac{e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))}-1}{|y|^{1+\alpha}}\,f(x+y)\,dy\,\|_p \\ &\le \int_{|y|\ge 1/100}\frac{2}{|y|^{1+\alpha}}\,\|f(\cdot+y)\|_p\,dy\ \le c_\alpha\|f\|_p. \end{aligned} \tag{2.59}$$

So, it remains to estimate

$$\|\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{\epsilon\le|y|\le 1/100}\frac{e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))}-1}{|y|^{1+\alpha}}\,f(x+y)dy\,\|_p. \tag{2.60}$$

From (2.58) (b) and the mean value theorem one has that

$$|e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))}-1|\le|\phi(x+y)-\phi(x)|=|y|\,|\int_0^1\phi'(x+sy)ds|, \tag{2.61}$$

with

$$\phi'(x)=(2+a)t|x|^{1+a}. \tag{2.62}$$

In particular, if $|x|\le 1$ one has

$$|e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))}-1|\le c_a\,|t|\,|y|,$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\int_{\epsilon\le|y|\le 1/100}\frac{e^{i(\phi(x+y)-\phi(x))}-1}{|y|^{1+\alpha}}\,f(x+y)dy\,\|_{L^p(B_1(0))} \\ &\le\ |t|\int_{|y|\le 1/100}\frac{\|f(\cdot+y)\|_{L^p(B_1(0))}}{|y|^{\alpha}}\,dy\le\ c_{\alpha,a}\,|t|\,\|f\|_p. \end{aligned} \tag{2.63}$$

From the above estimates we can restrict ourselves in (2.57) to the case:

$$|y|\le 1/100, \qquad \text{and} \qquad |x|\ge 1.$$

We sub-divide it into two parts:

$$(a)\quad |y|\,|x|^{1+a}\le 1, \qquad (b)\quad |y|\,|x|^{1+a}\ge 1. \tag{2.64}$$

In the case (a) in (2.64) we change variable, $\tilde{y}=|x|^{1+a}y$, use (2.58) part (b), (2.61), (2.62), Minkowski's inequality and a second change of variable to obtain the bound

$$\Big\| \int_{|y|\le 1/|x|^{1+a}} \frac{|t||x|^{1+a}\,|f(x+y)|}{|y|^{\alpha}} dy \Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})}$$

$$= \Big\| \int_{|\tilde y|\le 1} \frac{|t||x|^{\alpha(1+a)}\,|f(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}})|}{|\tilde y|^{\alpha}} d\tilde y \Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})}$$

$$\le \Big\| \int_{|\tilde y|\le 1} \frac{|t||x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}}|^{\alpha(1+a)}\,|f(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}})|}{|\tilde y|^{\alpha}} d\tilde y \Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})} \tag{2.65}$$

$$+ \Big\| \int_{|\tilde y|\le 1} \frac{|t||\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}}|^{\alpha(1+a)}\,|f(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}})|}{|\tilde y|^{\alpha}} d\tilde y \Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})}$$

$$\le c_{\alpha,a}|t|(\|\,|x|^{(1+a)\alpha} f\|_p + \|f\|_p),$$

since

$$\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}} = y, \quad |y|\le 1/100, \quad |x|\ge 1, \quad \text{so} \quad d(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}}) \sim dx. \tag{2.66}$$

In the case (b) in (2.64) changing variable, $\tilde y = |x|^{1+a}y$, using (2.58) part (a), Minkowski's inequality, and a second change of variable as in (2.66) we get

$$\Big\| \int_{|y||x|^{1+a}\ge 1} \frac{|f(x+y)|}{|y|^{1+\alpha}} dy \Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})}$$

$$= \Big\| \int_{|\tilde y|\ge 1} \frac{|x|^{(1+a)\alpha}}{|\tilde y|^{1+\alpha}} |f(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}})|\, d\tilde y \Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})}$$

$$\le c_{a,\alpha} \int_{|\tilde y|\ge 1} \Big\|\,|x|^{(1+a)\alpha} f(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}})\,\Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})} \frac{d\tilde y}{|\tilde y|^{1+\alpha}}$$

$$\le c_{a,\alpha} \int_{|\tilde y|\ge 1} \Big\|\,|x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}}|^{(1+a)\alpha} f(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}})\,\Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})} \frac{d\tilde y}{|\tilde y|^{1+\alpha}} \tag{2.67}$$

$$+ c_{a,\alpha} \int_{|\tilde y|\ge 1} \Big\| f(x+\frac{\tilde y}{|x|^{1+a}})\,\Big\|_{L^p(\{|x|\ge 1\})} \frac{d\tilde y}{|\tilde y|^{1+\alpha}}$$

$$\le c_{a,\alpha}\,(\|f\|_p + \|\,|x|^{(1+a)\alpha} f\|_p).$$

Therefore, collecting the above results we have the proof of the following:

Lemma 2.7. *Let $n=1$, $\alpha\in(0,1)$, $a\ge 0$, and $p\in(1,\infty)$. If*

$$f\in L^{\alpha,p}(\mathbb{R})\cap L^p(|x|^{\alpha(1+a)p}dx),$$

then for all $t\in\mathbb{R}$ *and for almost every* $x\in\mathbb{R}$

$$D_\alpha(e^{it|x|^{1+a}x}\, f)(x) = e^{it|x|^{1+a}x}\, D_\alpha f(x) + e^{it|x|^{1+a}x}\, \Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(f)(x), \tag{2.68}$$

with

$$\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(f)(x) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{c_\alpha}\int_{|y|\geq\epsilon}\frac{e^{it(|x+y|^{1+a}(x+y)-|x|^{1+a}x)}-1}{|y|^{1+\alpha}}\, f(x+y)dy, \tag{2.69}$$

$$\|\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(f)\|_p \leq c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|f\|_p + \|\,|x|^{\alpha(1+a)}\, f\|_p), \tag{2.70}$$

and c_α *as in* (2.49).

From the proof of Lemma 2.7 it follows that under appropriate assumptions on the regularity and the growth of $\varphi:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ one has that

$$D_{j,\alpha}(e^{it\varphi(x)}\, f)(x) = e^{it\varphi(x)}\, D_{j,\alpha}f(x) + e^{it\varphi(x)}\Phi_{j,\varphi,t,\alpha}(f)(x),$$

with

$$D_{j,\alpha}f(x) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{c_\alpha}\int_{|y_j|\geq\epsilon}\frac{f(x+y_j\,\vec{e}_j)-f(x)}{|y_j|^{1+\alpha}}dy_j, \tag{2.71}$$

$$\Phi_{j,\varphi,t,\alpha}(f)(x) = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{1}{c_\alpha}\int_{|y_j|\geq\epsilon}\frac{e^{it(\varphi(x+y_j\,\vec{e}_j)-\varphi(x))}-1}{|y_j|^{1+\alpha}}\, f(x+y_j\,\vec{e}_j)dy_j,$$

and

$$\|\Phi_{j,\varphi,t,\alpha}(f)\|_p \leq c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|f\|_p + \||\partial_{x_j}\varphi(x)|^\alpha\, f\|_p),$$

for $j=1,\dots,n$.

Next, we consider the unitary group of operators $\{W(t): t\in\mathbb{R}\}$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ defined as

$$W(t)u_0(x) = W_a(t)u_0(x) = (e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\widehat{u}_0(\xi))^\vee(x). \tag{2.72}$$

Thus, for $\alpha\in(0,1)$ using (2.50) one has that

$$|x|^\alpha\, W(t)u_0(x) = |x|^\alpha(e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\widehat{u}_0(\xi))^\vee(x) = (D_\alpha(e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\widehat{u}_0(\xi)))^\vee(x).$$

and from Lemma 2.7 that

$$D_\alpha(e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\,\widehat{u}_0)(\xi) = e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\, D_\alpha\widehat{u}_0(\xi) + e^{it|\xi|^{1+a}\xi}\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi), \tag{2.73}$$

with

$$\|\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)\|_p \leq c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|\widehat{u}_0\|_p + \|\,|\xi|^{\alpha(1+a)}\,\widehat{u}_0\|_p).$$

Hence, taking Fourier transform in (2.73) we obtain the identity

$$|x|^\alpha\, W(t)u_0(x) = W(t)(|x|^\alpha u_0)(x) + W(t)(\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^\vee)(x). \tag{2.74}$$

with $\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}$ as in (2.69) and

$$\begin{aligned}\|\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^\vee\|_2 &= \|\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)\|_2\\ &\leq c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|\widehat{u}_0\|_2 + \|\,|\xi|^{\alpha(1+a)}\,\widehat{u}_0\|_2)\\ &\leq c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|u_0\|_2 + \|\,D^{\alpha(1+a)}u_0\|_2).\end{aligned} \tag{2.75}$$

Moreover, we claim that if $\beta\in(0,\alpha)$, then

$$D^\beta(|x|^\alpha\, W(t)u_0)(x) = W(t)(D^\beta|x|^\alpha u_0)(x) + W(t)(D^\beta\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^\vee)(x). \tag{2.76}$$

with

$$\| D^{\beta}(\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^{\vee})(x)\|_2 \leq c_{a,\alpha,\beta}(1+|t|)(\|u_0\|_2 + \| D^{\beta+\alpha(1+a)}u_0\|_2). \tag{2.77}$$

Notice that for $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$ the identities (2.74) and (2.76) hold pointwise for each $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$.

To prove (2.77) we need to show that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D_x^{\beta}(\int \frac{e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)\,d\eta)^{\vee}\|_2 \\ &\leq c_{a,\alpha,\beta}(1+|t|)(\|u_0\|_2 + \|D^{\beta+\alpha(1+a)}u_0\|_2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.78}$$

Thus, we write

$$\begin{aligned} &\|D_x^{\beta}(\int \frac{e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)\,d\eta)^{\vee}\|_2 \\ &= \|(\int \frac{|\xi|^{\beta}(e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1)}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)\,d\eta)^{\vee}\|_2 \\ &= \|\int \frac{|\xi|^{\beta}(e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1)}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)\,d\eta\|_2 \\ &\leq \|\int \frac{|\xi|^{\beta}|e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1|}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,|\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)|\,d\eta\|_2 \\ &\leq c_{\beta}\|\int \frac{|\xi+\eta|^{\beta}|e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1|}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,|\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)|\,d\eta\|_2 \\ &\quad + c_{\beta}\|\int \frac{|\eta|^{\beta}|e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1|}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,|\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)|\,d\eta\|_2 \\ &= \Omega_1 + \Omega_2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.79}$$

Following the argument used in the proof of Lemma 2.7 to get (2.70) one has that

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1 &\leq c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\||\xi|^{\beta}\widehat{u}_0\|_2 + \| \,|\xi|^{\alpha(1+a)}|\xi|^{\beta}\widehat{u}_0\|_2) \\ &= c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|D^{\beta}u_0\|_2 + \|D^{\beta+\alpha(1+a)}u_0\|_2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.80}$$

To bound Ω_2 we observe that its estimate is similar to that used in the proof of Lemma 2.7 with $\alpha-\beta$ instead of α. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_2 &\leq c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|\widehat{u}_0\|_2 + \| \,|\xi|^{(\alpha-\beta)(1+a)}\widehat{u}_0\|_2) \\ &= c_{a,\alpha}(1+|t|)(\|u_0\|_2 + \|D^{(\alpha-\beta)(1+a)}u_0\|_2). \end{aligned} \tag{2.81}$$

Collecting the above information one obtains the proof of Lemma 1.2.

Remarks: (a) The hypothesis $\beta \in (0,\alpha)$ in Lemma 1.2 is necessary to bound

$$\|D^{\beta}(\{\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\}^{\vee})\|_2 = \||\xi|^{\beta}\Phi_{a,t,\alpha}(\widehat{u}_0)(\xi)\|_2,$$

$$=\|\int \frac{|\xi|^{\beta}(e^{it(|\xi+\eta|^{1+a}(\xi+\eta)-|\xi|^{1+a}\xi)}-1)}{|\eta|^{1+\alpha}}\,\widehat{u}_0(\xi+\eta)\,d\eta\|_2$$

in the region when $|\xi+\eta| \leq |\xi|/10$ with $|\xi| \sim |\eta| >> 1$.

(b) We observe that if $u_0 \in \mathcal{S}(\mathbb{R})$, then the pointwise identities (1.18)-(1.21) hold for all $(x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^2$. Therefore a density argument and the Strichartz estimate associated to the group $\{W(t) = W_a(t) \,:\, t \in \mathbb{R}\}$ (see [29])

$$(\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \|W(t)u_0\|_{\infty}^{4+2a} dt)^{1/(4+2a)} \leq c\|u_0\|_2, \qquad a \geq 0, \tag{2.82}$$

show that under the hypotheses of Lemma 1.2, (1.18)-(1.21) hold for all $x \in \mathbb{R}$ almost everywhere $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

3. Proof of Theorem 1.1

Let $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $s > \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{4}a$, and $|x|^\rho u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and consider the integral equation

$$\Psi(u)(t) = W_a(t)u_0 - \int_0^t W_a(t-t')u\partial_x u(t')\,dt'. \tag{3.83}$$

Define

$$\begin{aligned} |||v||| =& \|v\|_{L^\infty_T H^s} + \||x|^\rho v\|_{L^2_x} + \|D_x^{s+(1+a)/2} v\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T} + \|v\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T} \\ &+ \|v\|_{L^{1+a}_x L^\infty_T} + \|\partial_x v\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x} + \|D_x^{s-(1-a)/2} v\|_{L^{p_1}_x L^{q_1}_T} + \|\partial_x v\|_{L^{p_2}_x L^{q_2}_T}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.84}$$

where $\frac{1}{p_1} + \frac{1}{p_2} = \frac{1}{1+a}$ and $\frac{1}{q_1} + \frac{1}{q_2} = \frac{1}{2}$ with $p_1 = \frac{(1+a)(2s+1+a)}{2}$, $q_1 = \frac{2(2s+1+a)}{2s-1+a}$,

$p_2 = \frac{(1+a)(2s+1+a)}{2s-1+a}$, and $q_2 = 2s+1+a$.

We will show that there exist r and T positive numbers such that

$$\Psi : X_{r,T} = \{v \in C([0,T] : H^s(\mathbb{R}))\big|\ |||v||| \leq r\} \mapsto X_{r,T} \tag{3.85}$$

is a contraction.

The homogeneous smoothing effect (2.31) and (2.41) yield

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\Psi(u)\|_{L^\infty_T H^s} + \|D_x^{s+(1+a)/2}\Psi(u)\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T} \\ &\qquad \leq c\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{a/(1+a)}\,\|D_x^{s-(1-a)/2}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^{1+a}_x L^2_T} \\ &\qquad \leq c\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{a/(1+a)}\,\|u\|_{L^{1+a}_x L^\infty_T}\|D_x^{s+(1+a)/2}u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T} \\ &\qquad\quad + cT^{a/(1+a)}\|D_x^{s-(1-a)/2}u\|_{L^{p_1}_x L^{q_1}_T}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^{p_2}_x L^{q_2}_T} \\ &\qquad \lesssim c\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{a/(1+a)}\,|||u|||^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.86}$$

Above we have used the fact that the norms $\|D_x^{s-(1-a)/2}u\|_{L^{p_1}_x L^{q_1}_T}$ and $\|\partial_x u\|_{L^{p_2}_x L^{q_2}_T}$ are interpolated norms of $\|D_x^{s+(1+a)/2}u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T}$ and $\|u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T}$, thus the former norms are bounded by the latter ones.

Next we estimate the $\||x|^\rho \cdot\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}$–norm. We use (1.18)–(1.19) in Lemma 1.2.

$$\begin{aligned} \||x|^\rho\Psi(u)\|_2 &\leq \||x|^\rho W_a(t)u_0\|_2 + \||x|^\rho\int_0^t W_a(t-t')u\partial_x u(t')\,dt'\|_2 \\ &\leq \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + c(1+T)\|u_0\|_{(1+a)\rho,2} + \||x|^\rho(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^1_T L^2_x} \\ &\quad + c(1+T)(\|u\partial_x u\|_{L^1_T L^2_x} + \|D^{\rho(1+a)}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^1_T L^2_x}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.87}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\le \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + c(1+T)\|u_0\|_{(1+a)\rho,2}\\
&\quad + T\||x|^\rho u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)T^{1/2}\|u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T}\|D^{\rho(1+a)}\partial_x u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)T\|D_x^{\rho(1+a)}u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\le \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + c(1+T)\|u_0\|_{s,2} + T\||x|^\rho u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)T^{1/2}\|u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T}\|D^{\rho(1+a)}\partial_x u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)T\|u\|_{L^\infty_T H^s}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\le c_T(\||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + \|u_0\|_{s,2})\\
&\quad + cT^{1/2}(1+T)(1+T^{1/2})|||u|||^2.
\end{aligned}$$

since $\rho(1+a) < \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{4}a$ and $\rho(1+a)+1 < \frac{3}{2} - \frac{3}{4}a + \frac{1+a}{2}$.

Now we estimate the L^2 maximal function norm for Ψ. We use the inequality (2.35), group properties, Leibniz's rule and the hypotheses to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Psi(u)\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T} &\le c_T\,\|u_0\|_{(2+a)/4,2} + \|J^{(2+a)/4}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^1_T L^2_x}\\
&\le c_T\,\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{1/2}\|J^{s-(1-a)/2}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^2_x L^2_T}\\
&\le c_T\,\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{1/2}\|u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T}\|D_x^{s+(1+a)/2}u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T}\\
&\quad + cT\|u\|_{L^\infty_T H^s}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\le c_T\,\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{1/2}(1+T^{1/2})|||u|||^2.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.88}$$

To bound Ψ in the $L^{1+a}_x L^\infty_T$–norm we first use Lemma 2.4, then we introduce a cut-off function $\chi \in C_0^\infty$, $supp\,\chi \subset (-1,1)$ and $\chi \equiv 1$ on $(-1/2,1/2)$, to apply the inequality (2.45) and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\Psi(u)\|_{L^{1+a}_x L^\infty_T} &\le c(\|J^\beta(|x|^{\omega+}u_0)\|_2 + \|u_0\|_{(4-a)/4,2})\\
&\quad + cT^{1/2}\|J^\beta(|x|^{\omega+}(u\partial_x u))\|_{L^2_x L^2_T} + cT^{1/2}\|J^{(4-a)/4}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^2_x L^2_T}\\
&\lesssim c(\||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + \|u_0\|_{s,2})\\
&\quad + cT^{1/2}\||x|^\rho(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^2_x L^2_T} + cT^{1/2}\|D^{s-(1-a)/2}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^2_x L^2_T}\\
&\lesssim c\big(\||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + \|u_0\|_{s,2}\big) + cT\||x|^\rho u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\quad + cT^{1/2}\|u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T}\|D^{s+(1+a)/2}u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T} + cT\|u\|_{L^\infty_T H^s}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\lesssim c\big(\||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + \|u_0\|_{s,2}\big) + cT^{1/2}(1+T^{1/2})|||u|||^2.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.89}$$

Finally, we estimate $\partial_x\Psi$ in the Strichartz norm

$$\begin{aligned}
\|\partial_x\Psi(u)\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x} &\le c\|D_x^{(4-a)/4}u_0\|_{L^2_x} + c\|D_x^{(4-a)/4}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^1_T L^2_x}\\
&\le c\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{1/2}\|u\|_{L^2_x L^\infty_T}\|D_x^{s+(1+a)/2}u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T}\\
&\quad + cT\|u\|_{L^\infty_T H^s}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\le c\|u_0\|_{s,2} + cT^{1/2}(1+T^{1/2})|||u|||^2.
\end{aligned}\tag{3.90}$$

From (3.86)–(3.90) we have that

$$|||\Psi(u)||| \le c_T(\|u_0\|_{s,2} + \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2) + cT^{a/1+a}(1+T)(1+T^{1/2})|||u|||^2. \tag{3.91}$$

Taking $r = 2c_T(\|u_0\|_{s,2} + \||x|^{\rho}u_0\|_2)$ and T sufficiently small such that

$$cT^{a/1+a}(1+T)(1+T^{1/2})r < 1/2$$

we show that $\Psi : X_{r,T} \mapsto X_{r,T}$. That Ψ is a contraction follows from a similar argument. Since the remainder of the proof is standard we omit the details. This completes the local part of Theorem 1.1.

Next, we shall see how to extend it to any time interval $[0, T_1]$. We recall that $u_0 \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ with $s \geq 3/2 - 3a/4$. So from the result in [22] one has that the IVP (1.1) has a solution u_1 such that

$$u_1 \in C([0, T_1] : H^s(\mathbb{R})). \tag{3.92}$$

From the result in [30] (Theorem 1.3) one also has that the IVP (1.1) has a solution u_2 such that

$$u_2 \in C([0, T_2] : H^s(\mathbb{R})), \qquad \text{with} \quad T_2 = T_2(\|u_0\|_{s,2}) > 0, \tag{3.93}$$

satisfying that

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\partial_x u\|^4_{L^4_{T_2} L^\infty_x} = \int_0^{T_2} \|\partial_x u(t)\|^4_\infty dt < \infty, \\ &\|D^{s-(1-a)/2}\partial_x u\|^2_{l^\infty_j(L^2([j,j+1]\times[0,T_2]))} \\ &\qquad = \sup_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \int_0^{T_2}\int_j^{j+1} |D^{s-(1-a)/2}\partial_x u(x,t)|^2 dx dt < \infty, \\ &\|u\|^2_{l^2_j(L^\infty([j,j+1]\times[0,T_2]))} = \sum_{j\in\mathbb{Z}} \sup_{(x,t)\in[j,j+1]\times[0,T_2]} |u(x,t)|^2 < \infty. \end{aligned} \tag{3.94}$$

Also from our above local result we have that the IVP (1.1) has a solution u_3 such that

$$u_3 \in C([0, T_3] : Z_{s,\rho}), \qquad \text{with} \quad T_3 = T_3(\|u_0\|_{s,2} + \||x|^{\rho}u_0\|_2) > 0, \tag{3.95}$$

Clearly, one has that

$$0 < T_3 \leq T_2 \leq T_1.$$

First, we observe that combining a density argument, the continuous dependence of the solution upon the data, the fact that $s > 1/2$ and the unconditional uniqueness in the class

$$C([0, T^*] : H^2(\mathbb{R})), \qquad \forall\, T^* > 0,$$

of solutions of the IVP (1.1) one gets that these three solutions u_1, u_2, u_3 agree in the common domain $\mathbb{R} \times [0, T_3]$. Since

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_1]} \|u_1(t)\|_{s,2} = K = K(\|u_0\|_{s,2}; T_1), \tag{3.96}$$

we have an *a priori* estimate of the solution u_2 in the time interval $[0, T_2]$. Therefore, reapplying the local existence in [30] (Theorem 1.3) with $\Delta t_2 = \Delta t_2(K) > 0$ as in (3.93) $T_1/\Delta t_2$-times we extend the solution u_2 to the whole interval $[0, T_1]$ in the class defined in (3.93) and (3.94) with a bound in all these norms equal to

$M = M(\|u\|_{s,2}; T_1)$. Using this we shall show that u_3 can be extended to the whole interval $[0, T_1]$ in the class defined in (1.10)-(1.12).

For this it will suffice to get an *a priori* estimate of

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_1]} \||x|^\rho u_3\|_2.$$

We use the inequality proved in [31]: if $b \in (0,1)$, then

$$\|D^b(fg) - fD^b g\|_2 \le c\|g\|_\infty \|D^b f\|_2,$$

to get that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|D^{\rho(1+a)}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^2_T L^2_x}\\
&\quad\le c\|uD^{\rho(1+a)}\partial_x u\|_{L^2_T L^2_x} + cT^{1/4}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\|D^{\rho(1+a)}u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|uD^{\rho(1+a)}\partial_x u\|_{L^2_T L^2_x} = \|uD^{\rho(1+a)}\partial_x u\|_{l^2_j(L^2([j,j+1]\times[0,T]))}\\
&\quad\le c\|u\|_{l^2_j(L^\infty([j,j+1]\times[0,T]))}\|D^{\rho(1+a)+1}u\|_{l^\infty_j(L^2([j,j+1]\times[0,T]))}.
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above estimates, the argument in (3.87) and Lemma 2.6 it follows that for $T \in (0, T_3]$

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sup_{t\in[0,T]} \||x|^\rho u_3\|_2\\
&\le \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \||x|^\rho W_a(t)u_0\|_2 + \sup_{t\in[0,T]} \||x|^\rho \int_0^t W_a(t-t')u\partial_x u(t')\,dt'\|_2\\
&\le \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + c(1+T)\|u_0\|_{(1+a)\rho,2} + c\||x|^\rho(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^1_T L^2_x}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)(\|u\partial_x u\|_{L^1_T L^2_x} + \|D^{\rho(1+a)}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^1_T L^2_x})\\
&\le \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + c(1+T)\|u_0\|_{s,2}\\
&\quad + cT^{3/4}\||x|^\rho u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)(T\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|u(t)\|^2_{1,2} + T^{1/2}\|D^{\rho(1+a)}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L^2_T L^2_x})\\
&\le \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + c(1+T)\|u_0\|_{s,2}\\
&\quad + cT^{3/4}\||x|^\rho u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x} + c(1+T)T\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|u(t)\|^2_{1,2}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)T^{3/4}\,\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x}\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\|u(t)\|_{s,2}\\
&\quad + c(1+T)T^{1/2}\|u\|_{l^2_j(L^\infty([j,j+1]\times[0,T]))}\|D^{\rho(1+a)}\partial_x u\|_{l^\infty_j(L^2([j,j+1]\times[0,T]))})\\
&\le \||x|^\rho u_0\|_2 + c(1+T)\|u_0\|_{s,2}\\
&\quad + cT^{3/4}\||x|^\rho u\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x} + cT^{1/2}(1+T)^2M^2.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.97}$$

Hence, by taking T such that

$$cT^{3/4}\|\partial_x u\|_{L^4_T L^\infty_x} \le cT^{3/4}M \le 1/2, \qquad \text{with} \quad T \in (0, T_3), \tag{3.98}$$

one has that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\||x|^{\rho}u_3\|_2\\ &\le 2\||x|^{\rho}u_0\|_2+2c+2c(1+T)M+2cT^{1/2}(1+T)^2M^2\\ &\le 2\||x|^{\rho}u_0\|_2+2cR(M).\end{aligned}\tag{3.99}$$

From (3.98) one has that the second term on the right hand side of (3.99) depends only on $M=M(\|u_0\|_2;T_1)$. Thus, the growth in the interval $[0,T]$ is controlled by the double of its initial value plus a fixed constant (in the whole interval $[0,T_1]$). The same argument provides the result in any interval $\mathcal{I}\subset[0,T_1]$ of length $|\mathcal{I}|\le T$. Hence, reapplying this method T_1/T-times we obtain the desired *a priori* estimate for

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T_1]}\||x|^{\rho}u_3\|_2\le C=C(\||x|^{\rho}u_0\|_2;\|u_0\|_{s,2};T_1).$$

which completes the proof of Theorem 1.1.

4. Proof of Theorem 1.3

We fix $a\in(0,1)$ and consider a datum u_0 such that

$$u_0\in H^{3/2-\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}),\quad xu_0,\,x\partial_x u_0\in L^2(\mathbb{R}),\quad\text{and}\quad u_0\in C^1(\mathbb{R}-\{0\}).$$

with $\epsilon>0$ small enough such that for some $\rho'>\rho_a=\frac{3(4-a)(2-a)}{4(8+a-3a^2)}$ one has

$$0>-3a/4+(1+a)(\rho'-\rho_a)+\epsilon.$$

By Theorem 1.1 and its remark (a) one has that for any $T>0$ the corresponding solution $u(x,t)$ satisfies

$$u\in C([-T,T]:H^{3/2-\epsilon}(\mathbb{R})\cap L^2(|x|^{2\rho'}dx)).$$

From the proof of Theorem 1.1 we have that

$$u(t)=W_a(t)u_0-\int_0^t W_a(t-t')u\partial_x u(t')dt'.$$

Using the operator $\Gamma_a=x+(2+a)tD^{1+a}$ and the hypotheses on u_0 we have that

$$\Gamma_a\partial_x W_a(t)u_0=(x+(2+a)tD^{1+a})W_a(t)(\partial_x u_0)=W_a(t)(x\partial_x u_0)\in C(\mathbb{R}:L^2(\mathbb{R})).$$

This tells us that for any $t\neq 0$ one has that

$$D^{1+a}\partial_x W_a(t)u_0\in C(\mathbb{R}:L^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R})),$$

therefore for any $t\neq 0$

$$W_a(t)u_0\in C^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

In remains to show that for any $t\neq 0$

$$\int_0^t W_a(t-t')u\partial_x u(t')dt'\in C^1(\mathbb{R}).$$

It will suffice to show that for any $t\neq 0$

$$\int_0^t W_a(t-t')u\partial_x u(t')dt'\in H^{3/2+\epsilon}(\mathbb{R}).\tag{4.100}$$

We observe by interpolation between the group properties and (2.34) one has that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|D^{3/2+\epsilon}\int_0^t W_a(t-t')u\partial_x u(t')dt\|_{L^\infty_T L^2_x}\\
&\le cT^{(a-2\epsilon)/(1+a)}\|D^{s-(1-a)/2}(u\partial_x u)\|_{L_x^{(1+a)/(1+2\epsilon)}L^2_T}\\
&\le cT^{(a-2\epsilon)/(1+a)}\ \|u\|_{L_x^{(1+a)/(1+2\epsilon)}L^\infty_T}\|D^{s+(1+a)/2}u\|_{L^\infty_x L^2_T}
\end{aligned}$$

Reapplying now the argument used in (3.89) we get that for $\epsilon > 0$ and sufficiently small, $\|u\|_{L_x^{(1+a)/(1+2\epsilon)}L^\infty_T}$ is bounded which proves (4.100). This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Abdelouhab, J. L. Bona, M. Felland, and J.-C. Saut, *Nonlocal models for nonlinear dispersive waves*, Physica D. **40** (1989) 360–392.

[2] M. J. Ablowitz and A. S. Fokas, *The inverse scattering transform for the Benjamin-Ono equation, a pivot for multidimensional problems*, Stud. Appl. Math. **68** (1983), 1–10.

[3] C. Amick and J. Toland, *Uniqueness and related analytic properties for the Benjamin-Ono equation – a nonlinear Neumann problem in the plane*, Acta Math. **167** (1991) 107–126.

[4] T. B. Benjamin, *Internal waves of permanent form in fluids of great depth*, J. Fluid Mech. **29** (1967) 559–592.

[5] J. L. Bona and J-C. Saut, *Dispersive blowup of solutions of generalized Korteweg-de Vries equations*, J. Diff. Eqs. **103** (1993) 3–57.

[6] J. L. Bona and J-C. Saut, *Dispersive blow-up II. Schrödinger-type equations, optical and oceanic rogue waves*, Chin. Ann. Math. Ser. B **31** (2010) 793–818.

[7] J. L. Bona and R. Smith, *The initial value problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Roy. Soc. London **Ser A 278** (1978) 555–601.

[8] J. Bourgain, *Fourier transform restriction phenomena for certain lattice subsets and applications to nonlinear evolution equations I, II* , Geom. Funct. Anal. **3** (1993) 107–156, 209–262.

[9] J. Bourgain, *Refinements of Strichartz inequality and applications to 2D-NLS with critical nonlinearity*, Internat. Math. Res. Not. **5** (1998) 253–283.

[10] N. Burq and F. Planchon, *On the well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Math. Ann. **340** (2008) 497–542.

[11] R. Coifman and M. Wickerhauser, *The scattering transform for the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Inverse Problems **6** (1990) 825–860.

[12] J. Colliander, C. E. Kenig, and G. Stafillani, *Local well-posedness for dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equations*, Diff. and Int. Eqs **16** (2002) 1441–1471.

[13] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Stafillani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao, *Almost conservation laws and global rough solutions to a nonlinear Schrodinger equation*, Math. Res. Letters **9** (2002) 659–682.

[14] J. Colliander, M. Keel, G. Stafillani, H. Takaoka, and T. Tao, *Sharp global well-posedness for KdV and modified KdV equations on* $\mathbb{R}$ *and* $\mathbb{T}$, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **16**, 3 (2003) 705–749.

[15] G. Fonseca and G. Ponce, *The I.V.P for the Benjamin-Ono equation in weighted Sobolev spaces*, J. Funct. Anal. **260** (2011) 436–459.

[16] G. Fonseca, F. Linares, and G. Ponce, *The I.V.P for the Benjamin-Ono equation in weighted Sobolev spaces II*, J. Funct. Anal. **262** (2012) 2031–2049.

[17] G. Fonseca, F. Linares, and G. Ponce, *The IVP for the dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equation in weighted Sobolev spaces*, *Ann. I. H. Poincaré-AN* (2012), http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.anihpc.2012.06.006.

[18] R. L. Frank and E. Lenzmann, *Uniqueness and non-degeneracy of ground states for* $(-\Delta)^s Q + Q - Q^{\alpha+1} = 0$ *in* $\mathbb{R}$, preprint.

[19] Z. Guo, *Global well-posedness of the Korteweg-de Vries equation in* $H^{-3/4}(\mathbb{R})$, J. Math. Pures Appl. **91** (2009) 583–597.

[20] Z. Guo, *Local well-posedness for dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equations in Sobolev spaces*, J. Diff. Eqs **252** (2012) 2053–2084.

[21] S. Herr, *Well-posedness for equations of Benjamin-Ono type*, Illinois J. Math. **51** (2007) 951–976.

[22] S. Herr, A. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig, and H. Koch, *A para-differential renormalization technique for nonlinear dispersive equations*, Comm. P. D. E. **35** (2010) 1827–1875.

[23] A. D. Ionescu and C. E. Kenig, *Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation on low-regularity spaces*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **20** (2007) 753–798.

[24] A. D. Ionescu, C. E. Kenig, and D. Tataru, *Global well-posedness for the KP-I initial value problem in the energy space*, Invent. Math. **173** (2008) 265–304.

[25] R. J. Iorio, *On the Cauchy problem for the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Comm. P. D. E. **11** (1986) 1031–1081.

[26] T. Kato, *On the Cauchy problem for the (generalized) Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Advances in Mathematics Supplementary Studies, Studies in Applied Math. **8** (1983) 93–128.

[27] C. E. Kenig and K. D. Koenig, *On the local well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono and modified Benjamin-Ono equations*, Math. Res. Letters **10** (2003) 879–895.

[28] C. E. Kenig, Y. Martel, and L. Robbiano, *Local well-posedness and blow up in the energy space for a class of* L^2 *critical dispersion generalized Benjamin-Ono equations*, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire **28** (2011) 853–887.

[29] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, Oscillatory integrals and regularity of dispersive equations, *Indiana Univ. Math. J.* **40** (1991), 33–69.

[30] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, *Well-posedness of the initial value problem Korteweg-de Vries equation*, J. Amer. Math. Soc. **4** (1991) 323–347.

[31] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, *Well-posedness and scattering results for the generalized Korteweg-de Vries equation via the contraction principle*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **46** (1993) 527–620.

[32] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, *A bilinear estimate with applications to the KdV equation*, J. Amer. Math. Soc **9** (1996) 573–603.

[33] C. E. Kenig, G. Ponce, and L. Vega, *On the unique continuation of solutions to the generalized KdV equation*, Math. Res. Letters **10** (2003) 833–846.

[34] N. Kishimoto, *Well-posedness of the Cauchy problem for the Korteweg-de Vries equation at the critical regularity*, Diff. Int. Eqs. **22** (2009) 447–464.

[35] H. Koch and N. Tzvetkov, *On the local well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation on* $H^s(\mathbb{R})$, Int. Math. Res. Not. **26** (2003) 1449–1464.

[36] H. Koch and N. Tzvetkov, *Nonlinear wave interactions for the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **30** (2005), 1833–1847.

[37] D. J. Korteweg and G. de Vries, *On the change of form of long waves advancing in a rectangular canal, and on a new type of long stationary waves*, Philos. Mag. 5 **39** (1895) 22–443.

[38] F. Linares, *A higher order modified Korteweg-de Vries equation*, Mat. Apl. Comput. **14** (1995) 253–267.

[39] F. Linares and M. Scialom, *On the smoothing properties of solutions to the modified Korteweg-de Vries equation*, J. Diff. Eqs. **106** (1993) 141–154.

[40] F. Linares and G. Ponce, *Introduction to Nonlinear Dispersive Equations*, Universitext. Springer 2009.

[41] L. Molinet and D. Pilod, *The Cauchy problem for the Benjamin-Ono equation in L^2revisited*, Analysis & PDE **5** (2012) 365–395.

[42] L. Molinet and F. Ribaud, *Well-posedness results for the Benjamin-Ono equation with arbitrary large initial data*, Int. Math. Res. Not. **70** (2004) 3757–3795.

[43] L. Molinet and F. Ribaud, *On global well-posedness for a class of nonlocal dispersive wave equations*, Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **15** (2006) 657–668.

[44] L. Molinet, J.-C. Saut, and N. Tzvetkov, *Ill-posedness issues for the Benjamin-Ono and related equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **33** (2001) 982–988.

[45] J. Nahas and G. Ponce, *On the persistent properties of solutions to semi-linear Schrödinger equation*, Comm. P.D.E. **34** (2009) 1–20.

[46] H. Ono, *Algebraic solitary waves on stratified fluids*, J. Phy. Soc. Japan **39** (1975) 1082–1091.

[47] G. Ponce, *On the global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation*, Diff. Int. Eqs. **4** (1991) 527–542.

[48] J.-C. Saut, *Sur quelques généralisations de l' équations de Korteweg-de Vries*, J. Math. Pures Appl. **58** (1979) 21–61.

[49] E. M. Stein, *The Characterization of Functions Arising as Potentials*, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **67** (1961) 102–104.

[50] T. Tao, *Global well-posedness of the Benjamin-Ono equation on H^1*, J. Hyp. Diff. Eqs. **1** (2004) 27-49. Int. Math. Res. Not., Art. ID 95702 (2006) 1–44.

[51] M. I. Weinstein, *Solitary waves of nonlinear dispersive evolution equations with critical power nonlinearities*, J. Diff. Eqs **69** (1987) 192–203.
(1966) 1–17.

(G. Fonseca) Departamento de Matemáticas, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogota, Colombia
E-mail address: `gefonsecab@unal.edu.co`

(F. Linares) IMPA, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
E-mail address: `linares@impa.br`

(G. Ponce) Department of Mathematics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106, USA.
E-mail address: `ponce@math.ucsb.edu`